FEELING IT

Language, Race, and Affect in Latinx Youth Learning

Edited by
Mary Bucholtz
Dolores Inés Casillas
Jin Sook Lee

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

First published 2018
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Bucholtz, Mary, 1966– editor. | Casillas, Dolores Inés editor. | Lee, Jin-Sook editor.
Title: Feeling it : language, race, and affect in Latinx youth learning / edited by Mary Bucholtz, Dolores Inés Casillas, Jin Sook Lee [editors].
Description: New York : Routledge, 2018. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2017042907 | ISBN 9781138296794 (hardback) | ISBN 9781138296800 (pbk.) | ISBN 9781351583954 (epub) | ISBN 781351583947 (mobipocket/kindle)
Subjects: LCSH: Hispanic American youth—Language. | Language and education—United States. | Hispanic American youth—Racial identity. | Racism in education—United States. | Multicultural education—United States.
Classification: LCC P40.5.H57 F44 2018 | DDC 306.44/08968073—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2017042907

ISBN: 978-1-138-29679-4 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-138-29680-0 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-315-09972-9 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

To the past, present, and future SKILLS student researcher–activists, for teaching us.

APPENDIX

Transcription Conventions

;	Speaker attribution
.	Terminative intonation
,	Continuative intonation
?	Appeal
:	Prosodic lengthening
=	Latching
-	Truncated/cut-off word
@	Laughter
(1.1)	Measured pause of greater than 0.5 second
[ ]	Overlap (first pair)
[$_2$]	Overlap (second pair)
(H)	Inhalation
(Hx)	Exhalation
((words))	Analyst comment on gesture or gaze
words	Spanish
('words')	Translation

Adapted from John W. Du Bois et al. (1992).

13

AFTER AFFECTS

Mary Bucholtz, Dolores Inés Casillas, and Jin Sook Lee

Introduction: Political Effects and Affects

Since we began the collaboration that was the starting point for this book back in 2013, much has changed in our university, the state of California, the nation, and the world. Much has also changed in the SKILLS program and in our teaching and research, in part due to these larger-scale changes but in greater part due to our experience of collaboration with one another and with the brave and brilliant graduate students—some of whom have now earned their Ph.D.s—who share their thoughts, feelings, and insights within this volume.

At the level of institutional and political changes, the most obvious difference is the new political landscape in which we find ourselves. The Trump regime makes explicit and unmistakable the longstanding white conservative affects of racial hatred, fear, and domination that many white liberal Americans had tried to downplay or ignore, resulting in their own affective "performances of vulnerability, suffering, and anxiety" in the wake of the election (Rosa & Bonilla 2017: 203). We have seen the effects of these turbulent white affects and the policies that they give rise to in the SKILLS program, particularly in the well-founded fears of the Latinx youth researcher–activists regarding their own and their family members' future in a racially hostile nation.

These circumstances have spurred the SKILLS team to increasingly overt engagement with political issues in their classrooms, sometimes with the enthusiastic support of our partner teachers and at other times in spite of their resistance or reluctance. It has also inspired us to make the use of Spanish more central to SKILLS: In addition to an existing class with youth from a Mexican indigenous immigrant community, which is taught in both Spanish and English, following the 2016 election we expanded the program to a Spanish/English dual-language

immersion charter elementary school as well as to English Language Development classes for high school students who have recently arrived in the United States. In this way we have been able to support and validate young people's Spanish abilities both pedagogically and politically. We see the role of SKILLS not merely as offering young people new perspectives on their lived experience with language but crucially as forging alliances with racialized youth as they use their affective agency to confront the nation's long and ongoing history of racism and especially the retrograde form that it has taken in this new political era.

While the United States as a whole has been moving in dangerous directions, the state of California has begun, in small but significant ways, to undo some of its own history of racist policy. Most notable in this regard is California voters' passage of Proposition 58 in November 2016, which repealed the ban on bilingual education instituted by Proposition 227 in 1998. Proposition 58 was developed by a Latino state senator, Ricardo Lara, and placed on the ballot by a vote of the California Legislature—facts that indicate how much the state's political and demographic landscape differs both from the California of the past and from the United States of the present day. The educational effects of this change in the law are still unclear, but encouragingly, it authorizes local school districts throughout the state to bring back primary language support for English language learners and to create dual-language immersion programs, thus enabling students to maintain and develop their home languages even as they acquire an additional language.

However, the repeal of Proposition 227 comes too late for an entire generation of California youth, most of them Latinx. Nearly all of the students we have worked with in the SKILLS program since its inception have experienced their U.S. schooling exclusively in English, a situation that has resulted in feelings of shame or frustration about their abilities in their home languages—and often about their English as well. SKILLS has sought to address this imposed affective positioning in several ways: first, by calling attention to students' home language abilities—including unrecognized or devalued abilities like receptive bilingualism and the use of a distinctive U.S.-based variety of Spanish—as valuable cultural knowledge and hard-won achievements in the face of racist and xenophobic educational policies and practices; second, by acknowledging youth as linguistic innovators who keep language vibrant through creative practices such as translanguaging and the use of slang; and third, by directly challenging the raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa 2015) that uphold white supremacy in the United States. Validating young Latinxs' pain and anger at what the educational system has taken from them by force goes hand in hand with valorizing their abundant linguistic, cultural, and political knowledge, abilities, and insights.

Finally, the university where the three of us teach has also undergone important changes since the SKILLS program began. In 2015, the University of California, Santa Barbara was designated a Hispanic-Serving Institution by the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities, the first major research university to achieve this status. This shift in our institution's student population has directly

benefited the SKILLS program, which actively recruits undergraduate and graduate student team members whose backgrounds are similar to those of the youth participants. To be sure, this status also creates serious concerns about the commodification of Latinx students as emblems of campus "diversity" (Urciuoli 2010) as well as their exploitation for special funding that may or may not directly benefit them. However, the transformation of our campus to more closely reflect the demographics of our state and our region is an important step toward greater social and educational justice for Latinx communities.

In light of these political and demographic changes, our understanding of what SKILLS is and can be has also changed. But as we noted above, the biggest impact on our work within the program and as researchers, educators, advocates, and activists has come not from these larger shifts but from our experiences within the program itself, through the sometimes difficult, often invigorating, but always necessary intimacies of teaching and learning, talking and writing with one another and with our graduate and undergraduate students. In the introduction to this volume, we discussed the intellectual and political projects that are at work in the contributors' chapters. In this afterword, we want to go more deeply into the emotional stakes of this collection of research as well as its insights for our work in the SKILLS program going forward. We especially seek to reflect on our own and our graduate students' affects in undertaking and pursuing this project, because the development of these chapters from the authors' initial research plans to their multiple draft manuscripts and now the printed volume has been a viscerally emotional experience for all of us.

Academic Affects

Although emotion is always a key factor in the creation of scholarship of any kind, the affective dimensions of the research process are generally erased from most research products or relegated to carefully contained expressions of affect at the margins of academic writing. With so few models to turn to, it is especially admirable that the contributors to this volume, all of them at the beginning of their scholarly careers, were willing to explore the issues of affect so deeply and powerfully. Every author pushed themselves (and in our writing workshops we collectively we pushed one another) well beyond their comfort zone—exploring literatures in unfamiliar fields, examining data from new analytic perspectives, exposing their own affective experiences in their writing, confronting the emotional challenges of academic writing, and reflecting constructively and critically on the relationship between their own and others' embodied subjectivities. Inscribed in these chapters is the dual affect of pain and hope that accompanies the uncertain processes of creation, discovery, and struggle—processes that are inherent to meaningful research and meaningful teaching and learning alike.

Our introductory chapter addresses the intellectual stakes of affect as it intersects with language and race, but it does not address the personal stakes of the issue

for each of us as authors, editors, and directors of the SKILLS program. Here we are inspired by our student–colleagues' fearlessness and generosity in sharing their emotional, embodied experiences of language, race, and education both before they arrived at UCSB as graduate students and in their lives as scholars and educators at the university. Each of us discusses our own experiences below in the first person singular, since our disparate subject positions offer very different perspectival angles on the experience of collaboration with youth, teachers, undergraduate and graduate students, and one another.

Mary

I'm somewhat surprised to find myself involved in a project focused on affect. I've spent much of my career steering clear of psychological approaches to language, which for the most part I find sterile and unpersuasive, and even in my personal life I'm avowedly unsentimental. But through the SKILLS program, the Crossroads initiative, and my own teaching and research, it became clear to me that a psychological approach isn't the only way to understand affect. Inspired by work that demonstrates the social, cultural, embodied, and interactional dimensions of supposedly interior psychological processes of thinking and feeling (e.g., Hutchins 1995; Meyer, Streeck, & Jordan 2017), as well as the inherently political nature of these processes (e.g., Ahmed 2004b; Berg & Ramos-Zayas 2015), I began to understand cognition and especially emotion as crucial to the questions that drive me as a scholar: questions of identity, of agency, and of power.

Perhaps the real surprise, then, is that it took me so long to take up the question of affect. My previous research on language, race, and white youth was shot through with affective issues (Bucholtz 2011), and much of my work is grounded in ethnography, in which the researcher's subjectivity is acknowledged to have a central role. Moreover, my teaching focuses on emotionally fraught topics of race as well as gender and sexuality. Yet, somehow, I imagined that my own affective positionality was irrelevant to exploring affect in my research and teaching.

Two teaching experiences helped me to recognize the fundamental importance of affect. The first, as described in Chapter 2 of this volume, was the intensely affective environment of the Crossroads seminar, where thinking and feeling were more visibly interconnected and rooted in embodied subject positions than in any other class I had taught or taken. Unlike the fields of Chicanx studies or education, emotion has been shunned in linguistics as inappropriate to a discipline with scientific pretensions. Moreover, as a white woman from the rural Midwest, where emotionality is often seen as dangerous and out of control, I had been socialized to regulate and repress my emotions in public space. Thus, when emotions came to the forefront of our seminar discussions, I had no experience to draw on for how to engage effectively as a professor and simultaneously an affective being in my own right—to put it bluntly, I freaked out and froze up. Fortunately, my colleagues and students in other disciplines were more familiar with this terrain and offered valuable guidance to me and other seminar members who felt similarly unprepared to enter into strongly affective encounters in classroom settings.

The second teaching experience came in Spring 2014, when the Crossroads seminar was wrapping up and I was teaching a large lecture class on language, gender, and sexuality. In a horrific incident at UC Santa Barbara, a young man planned and carried out multiple murders, for twisted reasons of misogyny and racial resentment. Confronting this event with my students affectively, intellectually, and politically forced me to acknowledge that I could no longer leave my emotions at the classroom door. I have discussed some of the affective issues that arose at that terrible time in the history of our campus in a short publication and a longer, unpublished piece (Bucholtz 2016, 2017).

These experiences have made me a more emotionally engaged, honest, and—I hope—effective teacher and researcher. It is now evident to me that affect is a crucial part of the experience of collectively building knowledge, but one that I have buried for most of my academic career, both for my own self-protection in the emotionally perilous world of academia and the larger white-dominated society and because for many years I didn't have a way of conceptualizing affect that made sense to me as a scholar. My affective encounters with the SKILLS team—as my students, colleagues, teachers, and friends—have moved me in every sense of that word to spend the rest of my career finding ways to break down the artificial barriers between activism and scholarship, between research and teaching, and between thinking and feeling.

I continue to try not to fall into the academic stance of emotionally detached "objectivity" that protects me and other white researchers and educators from fully acknowledging the painful realities of racial injustice in the lives of our racialized students, colleagues, and research participants. I work, often unsuccessfully, to resist relaxing into comfortable familiarities in my professional life, to challenge the structural privileges of whiteness, and to experience my own personal "pedagogy of discomfort" (Boler 1999: 175) as a necessary part of the ongoing process of learning and unlearning race. It is all too easy to shelter in the safety of white supremacy, but given the precarious ground that people of color must walk every day, recognition of and critical engagement with our own and others' affects is an important way for us white people to become more fully human.

Inés

Although demographic research confirms that Latinx youth do not place Spanish-proficiency as a primary indicator of their racial and/or ethnic identification (Lopez 2016), none of these studies actually address *why*. When English dominance is validated, particularly in futuristic, optimistic terms (Rosa 2015), there's much less attention placed on the various institutional and informal ways that the United States engages in the public shaming of native Spanish speakers and their families. From English-only work policies and struggles to staff translators

at school meetings or health clinics to the mocking of accented speakers in U.S. popular culture, words generate disconcerting public perceptions about Spanish, Spanish-dominant speakers, and Spanish-accented speakers. Together, in Sara Ahmed's (2004a) terms, these racialized ideas comprise an affective economy, where the circulation and distribution of images, words, and objects elicit emotions across social and psychic fields. The SKILLS program addresses how such affective economies impact our own self-perceptions and biases about language, identity, and belonging.

The SKILLS experience deliberately departs from these troubling dominant narratives. The program situates often painful and complicated ideas about language proficiency with those of race, migration, and colonization. For instance, in using Gloria Anzaldúa's (1987) essay "How to Tame a Wild Tongue" to address familial, peer and school relationships with Chicanx English, Spanish, and the politics of translation, SKILLS, as seen in Chapter 11, encourages students not only to reflect on how language use is often policed but also to recognize the creative ways that language challenges ideas about bilingualism, proficiency, and/or fluency. It also forces non-Chicanx and Latinx students to grapple with Spanish outside the confines of a Spanish-language textbook; it provides an opportunity for students to accompany one another through discussions that distinguish between power and privilege; and it demonstrates how interdisciplinary approaches enrich our understandings of language.

My home department of Chicana and Chicano Studies was founded on the premise of teaching and articulating racialized notions of power and to motivate students of color to advocate for themselves as well as for others who are politically disenfranchised. Indeed, discussions of Spanglish and forms of Chicanx Spanish and English are topics often raised in our courses, where the majority of students are Latinx. My involvement with SKILLS and my teaching cross-listed undergraduate courses and graduate seminars, especially during the current "Build the Wall" era, have often reminded me that what I say may be second-guessed by how I say it. For this reason, as a bilingual Chicanx professor, I've felt an intense pressure to speak with authority (sternly), to cite quantitative as well as qualitative studies, and to self-monitor my speech (specifically my academic English)—and I have also experienced a profound sense of emotional vulnerability.

In my own writings on U.S. Spanish-language media (e.g., Casillas 2008, 2011, 2014), it's woefully apparent that Spanish holds a racialized and classed form of status. In capitalistic terms, Spanish is largely recognized as commercially unattractive by English-language media industries. Yet, for communities largely defined by language, class, and migration, Spanish plays the role of ally and provides a sense of solidarity during heightened moments of anti-immigrant anxieties. When I teach UCSB's large undergraduate course Language, Power, and Learning, which emerged from our Crossroads collaboration, inevitably, Latinx students are faced with affective situations when we analyze the use of words like "lonche" (lunch) and "rentar" (to rent); the "accented" pronunciation of "Gual-mar" (Wal-Mart) or "Con-fleis" (Corn Flakes); and the development of new-ish terms such as "washeros" for car wash personnel or "lavaplatos" for dishwashers—in short, we discuss how language is, indeed, living but also reflective of our affective economies: the racialized and classed standings of Latinx communities in the United States.

Jin Sook

I remember spending the earlier part of our Crossroads seminar trying to figure out how to teach across the three disciplines represented by each of us and what it means to do so. Intellectually I was stimulated just thinking about and seeing the intersections and connections made across our disciplines, awed by the freshness of the ideas presented; emotionally I was intimidated by the newness of interdisciplinary teaching and worried that I might overstep the boundaries of disciplinary and classroom managerial authority. I think I went into this context with a misguided assumption that because the participants, including the instructors, had self-identified as having a commitment to racialized youth and social justice and had voluntarily elected to there, we were ready to address sensitive and emotionally charged issues. The need to discuss or explicitly address how we were going to create a safe space for the participants didn't come up until we had already begun the seminar, when a student casually expressed their opinion about the "need to get over colonization" (see Chapter 2), a remark which exploded into hurt emotions and tension among the participants in the room. Although we never fully reached a point where we were truly able to create a safe space for all during the year-long seminar, it was that moment that starkly showed us all as class members how unprepared we were to deal collectively with the deeper and broader issues of racism and implications of the racialization processes. It forced us to be more honest and more introspective about our own affective positionalities, just as we regularly expected from the SKILLS youth researcher-activists.

As an Asian of Korean heritage who spent the earlier years of my childhood in the United States, somewhere along the path I trained myself to be nonreactive to and dismissive of injustices and hurtful emotions that were induced by things out of my control, like my race and ethnicity. I think this was my defense mechanism to protect my heart. In my own youth, I never had the opportunity to see myself as a social agent of change or to acquire tools to counter the processes of racialization, as some of the SKILLS youth researcher–activists have had. In fact, my silence and my willingness to just "cope" with injustices fit the mold of the "model minority," a patronizing label that positions Asians as passive, compliant Americans in the American hierarchical polity (Lee 2009). Although I found myself resonating with many of the social injustices and prejudices experienced by Latinx youth that we worked with and whose stories are recounted in these pages, I questioned my legitimacy to claim any emotional connection or parallel to what Latinx students experience, as if somehow the racial marginalization of Asians were less severe or less valid. As we know that processes of racialization

affect all youth of color, albeit in different ways, I hope today's youth do not succumb to numbing tactics as I did earlier in my life but are awake to their emotions and given the tools and support to embrace their affective agency, a goal that has become more prominent and clear with our work via SKILLS. As the incoming director of SKILLS, I look forward to expanding our program to reach more varied populations of students, including Asian Americans, whose activism has been less visible and whose voices have been less heard in our communities (e.g., Hoang 2015).

Given the emotional tensions in our Crossroads seminar, I would have never imagined that the topic of affect would be the common bond that would bring our cross-disciplinary work together. Although in the field of education there has been much lip service paid to the importance of educating the emotional and social aspects of the whole child, in reality the curricular activities and learning outcomes that seem to count center around measurable rational qualities such as language ability or reading comprehension ability, rather than the emotional or transformational affects of a child who goes from being monolingual to bilingual or from a novice to a fluent reader. How do we even begin to study or measure the complexity and the extreme messiness of affect? The contributors to this volume have made a brilliant start. I am immensely grateful for what I have learned about affect through the work of our contributors, which has enabled me to grow affectively as a scholar, researcher, educator, and person, and I continue to be greatly inspired by the courage of our SKILLS participants to express their most vulnerable emotions in front of others. It has become clear to me that the role of affect cannot be overlooked if we want to do work that truly makes a transformative difference in the lives of students. Even if it means stepping out of our comfort zone, we need to start rethinking and refocusing on the core of what it means to be human—emotions.

Affective Readings

The individual and collective experiences we reflect on above gave shape to this volume, helping us to see (finally) that the work we had been carrying out together was not only about language, race, and education but also, crucially, about affect. And although much of the time the three of us have spent working together has been focused on the affects of others—our students in the Crossroads seminar, the youth participants in the SKILLS program, the volume's contributors working to overcome affective obstacles like writer's block and imposter syndrome—our own affects have been at the heart of our work as well. As our final (for now) reflection on this project, we want to discuss how these chapters have affected us personally as sources of understanding and insight as we continue to improve the SKILLS program.

Although the original Crossroads seminar participants have not yet had an opportunity to come back together as a group to revisit the tensions and challenges

recounted by Rachel in Chapter 2, as an intellectual and political intervention, her writing has had effects that go well beyond those expected for academic scholarship. It has profoundly influenced our work as mentors and instructors of graduate students by helping us envision and begin to create graduate classrooms that make room for emotion as central to scholarly inquiry. As Rachel writes, "Recognizing just emotions as both a tool and a goal of sociolinguistic justice requires us to imagine and enact new ways of teaching and learning." As this book project comes to fruition, we hope to reconvene as many seminar participants as possible for an informal reunion, to take stock of where each of us stands intellectually, politically, and emotionally following our time together and how Rachel's deeply honest work helps us reexamine our earlier dialogues with one another in the seminar classroom and with her in the interview process.

Self-reflection is also a valuable element of Chapter 3, where Liz forthrightly discusses how her initial social science–oriented approach to her research overlooked the reality that research interviews, like musical performances, cannot be fully planned and controlled but instead rely on interaction in the moment. As Liz shows, when the researcher truly approaches the interview encounter as a conversation, the research emerges as the co-constructed product of interviewer and interviewee, and the resulting discoveries are much richer. Another important insight that we take from Liz's interviews with the SKILLS graduate teaching fellows is the need for educators to have an opportunity to reflect on our own educational, racial, and linguistic experiences, background, and goals before we enter the classroom as well as throughout the teaching process. For Liz, a former teacher herself, inviting such reflection and acting as an interlocutor for her research participants enabled her to accompany the teaching fellows for part of the way in their individual teaching journeys. Finally, her musical metaphor is a necessary reminder that all social encounters—from music making to teaching to research—are artful experiences from which our affective selves cannot be separated, as seen in her poetic representations of each interviewee's primary "motif."

In the same way, Chapter 4 by Anna and Sebastian is a courageous act of self-reflection and self-critique. We are in awe of their ability to step back and offer an analytic perspective on the difficulties they experienced in trying to translate the SKILLS program for a nonschool setting. And although the experiences they so candidly describe were specific to a particular situation, all of us have similar painful memories of teaching struggles (including, for the three of us, the teaching challenges documented in Rachel's chapter about the Crossroads seminar). Most professors wouldn't be willing to share such experiences with their own colleagues, let alone an international audience of readers. And although Anna and Sebastian are too kind to say so in their chapter, we ourselves failed to do enough to anticipate the difficulties that the radically different context of the Teen Center would present. As readers, we can best honor their courage and insight by looking critically at our own assumptions as educators, the countless small and large ways in which our teaching practices—from graduate seminars to

undergraduate lectures to programs like SKILLS—continue to reproduce "school as usual" despite our best efforts to do otherwise.

Jessi's chapter on the raciolinguistic ideologies of three SKILLS partner teachers invites reflection in a different way. Her analysis is both critical and compassionate, emerging as it does from her own subject position as a former teacher whose own ideologies toward her racialized students were not so different from those her interviewees expressed. Her discussion makes clear that one shortcoming of the SKILLS program is its failure to collaborate with partner teachers as fully as it should. With its unusual critical focus on language and race, the SKILLS curriculum introduces new ideas and perspectives not only to students but also to their teachers; however, the program does not provide teachers with a space to explore these ideas before they encounter them in the classroom alongside their students. We have therefore missed an opportunity to prepare teachers to engage with and contribute to the curriculum as full partners. Jessi's research is vital in helping us to see how SKILLS can strengthen its commitment to teachers and engage them in the same kinds of intellectual and affective explorations that we undertake with their students.

Like Jessi's chapter, Meghan's contribution to the volume raises a fundamental issue for the SKILLS program: the problem of whiteness. Not only are the vast majority of public schoolteachers white and thus often unprepared on the basis of their life experience to address race effectively with their students (Matias 2016), but as Meghan demonstrates in Chapter 6, even the best-planned discussions of race may be derailed or disrupted classrooms with a majority (or even a vocal minority) of white students. Her analysis reveals that these disruptions work largely through white affects that claim center stage and shut down other possible ways of feeling, seeing, and experiencing. It is evident that a different form of the SKILLS curriculum needs to be developed for such classrooms, as well as different strategies for guiding classroom interaction. In addition, Meghan's chapter shows us that we have a special responsibility to our undergraduate team members, particularly those who are themselves from racialized groups, to ensure that they feel fully prepared and supported when they take the lead within the classroom. Addressing these urgent issues will be central to the ongoing development of the SKILLS program.

In moving from ideologies within the classroom to larger sociopolitical processes, Adi underscores the intellectual and affective power of narrative—a central pedagogical and political resource for critical race theory and other antiracist perspectives (e.g., Solórzano & Yosso 2002). Her own narrative of being raciolinguistically positioned not only offers a powerful personal account of the inseparability of language, racialization, and affect but also serves as a form of accompaniment for the three students—los valientes—whose narratives she goes on to discuss. These students' courageous classroom narratives and political statements, as analyzed by Adi, also provide us with an important example of how to examine the relationship of language and race with students from a raciolinguistic perspective

(Rosa & Flores 2017). Relatedly, Adi's perspective as a Chicanx studies scholar has been invaluable in shifting the SKILLS curriculum toward a more central focus on race and racism. For us as SKILLS directors, this impetus pushes us to ensure that all of our instructors, regardless of their own disciplinary background, feel prepared to frame their teaching around these crucial issues.

Zuleyma's scholarly expertise likewise sheds light on an area where SKILLS falls short: giving parents the opportunity to engage with the issues that the program explores. As a specialist in involving parents in their children's education who is herself a bilingual Latina, Zuleyma brought a much-needed perspective to our collaborative work, reminding us that our responsibilities as educators do not stop with our students. SKILLS has primarily involved parents and other family members as participants in students' research and as audiences for their work, but Zuleyma's chapter demonstrates that much more can and should be done to create meaningful connections between parents and the program. Parents' own experiences with language and race in some ways mirror and in other ways diverge from those of racialized youth, and it is crucial both for young people and for the adults who work with them to understand these experiences. Conversely, parents often don't know about their children's raciolinguistic encounters and their affective impact. A crucial role for SKILLS, then, as shown by Zuleyma's own example, is to foster intergenerational dialogues in ways that are as safe and constructive as possible for all participants, providing information and support as well as spaces and structures for open, respectful communication.

Tijana's chapter provides a similar reminder that young people's families, present and future, are key contexts for them to engage with language as a social, cultural, political, and affective site. Tijana's transnational journey as a bilingual mother resonates with her students' family language policies and their bilingual aspirations for their future children, enabling her to connect with her students' linguistic autobiographies on a personal and affective level. At the same time, she shows that the SKILLS program must recognize the diversity of experiences and identities among bilingual Latinx youth. To be sure, SKILLS adapts its curriculum for each classroom in order to meet the needs of different groups, but Tijana's work calls attention to the fact that even within a single classroom a particular activity may result in different kinds of learning experiences and affects for individual students. Moreover, students' own experiences may not align with the categories that we impose on them: As Tijana notes, although she considered all of her Latinx students bilingual, they themselves felt compelled to choose a single identity as primarily English speakers or primarily Spanish speakers. For SKILLS to serve all students effectively, we must be attuned to the diversity of students' linguistic identities.

This diversity of student perspectives is also evident in Audrey's chapter, which highlights the skilled interactional and affective work that both students and educators perform in moments of disagreement and disalignment. Understanding these dynamics is critical to the success of teaching approaches—such as those

that are central to the SKILLS program—that introduce personally relevant, emotionally laden topics into the classroom and invite students to reflect on these topics from the perspective of their own experiences. To undertake such a pedagogical strategy without careful reflection and preparation risks the well-being of youth who have already endured racialized traumas throughout their schooling and other life experiences. But this chapter showcases the effectiveness of teachers who are well prepared and deeply invested in their students: Audrey and her coteacher Zuleyma's empathy toward their students, and their skill in managing the complexities of students' strongly felt and contrasting affects, offer these young people both validation and new perspectives.

As shown in Katie's chapter, another key source of insight into students' sometimes shared and sometimes divergent experiences and understandings is their writings. While journal writing has been a regular component of the SKILLS curriculum, Katie's incorporation of pedagogical insights from composition studies provides a valuable starting point for developing a fuller focus on literacy activities as part of the program. The affective power of writing is on abundant display in this chapter, which beautifully interweaves literary and scholarly quotations, student writing, and Katie's own analysis. The inclusion of images from the students' journal writing further enhances the chapter's affective power: Each student's handwritten reflection gives us as readers a sense of the embodied and emotional process of thinking and writing that gave rise to each text.

Finally, María's chapter offers a valuable perspective on the SKILLS program's goal of advancing educational justice. Even as the SKILLS team strives to provide an alternative to "school as usual" and to valorize the ways of speaking and writing that students bring with them into the classroom, we need to recognize that academic language, when introduced in the right way and for the right reasons, can provide young people with powerful new ways of conceptualizing and naming their experiences. At the same time, as the language of power, the academic register offers racialized youth a potent tool (but not unlimitedly so) for gaining entry into the white public space of most U.S. institutions of higher education. María's work foregrounds the importance of drawing on students' own personal and affective experiences to enable them to explore, take up, and make use of a key academic term, *community of practice*. As with many other chapters throughout the volume, María's chapter shows that personal narrative is a vital resource for racialized youth in the social justice classroom, functioning as testimonio that lays claim to the narrator's right to make their own meaning (Delgado Bernal, Burciaga, & Flores Carmona 2012).

These chapters make us think, but just as importantly they make us feel—and it is a credit to the power and honesty of the authors' writing that it continues to stir our emotions even after we have read and discussed multiple drafts over several years. We have learned a great deal from each of the contributors about language, race, and education; about the lives and knowledge of racialized youth; about socially meaningful teaching and learning; and about bringing our whole beings—our ideas, our emotions, our embodied subjectivities—to the work of understanding these issues.

Conclusion

This volume documents part of the long journey that the three of us have taken in accompaniment with our graduate and undergraduate students, our school and community organization partners, and the youth who have participated in the SKILLS program, but it also offers a road map for the future of the program and related initiatives. As we have learned both from our experiences within the program and from reflecting on those experiences through the Crossroads seminar and the creation of this text, affect is central not only to learning but also to teaching and research as well as to participation in the collective work of social change. For young people who have been the targets of processes of racialization, affects are powerful ideological weapons for positioning racialized groups within hegemonic structures—but they are equally powerful tools for mobilizing such groups and individuals to enact social agency to resist and reject this positioning.

Like the youth of color who have been part of SKILLS, we too have found in our affective encounters within the program the agency to enact social change. In light of what we have learned, we have redoubled our efforts to make the SKILLS program a valuable intellectual and affective experience for all participants—most crucially the youth researcher–activists whose creativity and wisdom inspire us, but also their teachers and family members as well as the dedicated graduate and undergraduate students who have generously contributed their time, energy, and passion to the program. Our vision of the program has changed considerably from the original and rather simple goal of exploring issues of language that young people rarely get the opportunity to discuss in schools. Instead, our driving purpose is now to create contexts for collaborative and transformational learning, teaching, and activism. As we move forward together with young people, their teachers, and our current and future graduate and undergraduate students, we aim to continue to work toward sociolinguistic justice and to forge collaborations grounded in the lived experience, linguistic and cultural expertise, and affective agency of racialized youth.

References

Ahmed, Sara. 2004a. Affective economies. *Social Text* 22(2): 117–139.

Ahmed, Sara. 2004b. *The cultural politics of emotion*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1987. How to tame a wild tongue. In *Borderlands/La frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute. 75–86.

Berg, Ulla D., and Ana Y. Ramos-Zayas. 2015. Racializing affect: A theoretical proposition. *Current Anthropology* 56(5): 654–677.

Boler, Megan. 1999. *Feeling power: Emotions and education*. New York: Routledge.
Bucholtz, Mary. 2011. *White kids: Language, race, and styles of youth identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Bucholtz, Mary. 2016. *Why bodies matter: Discourse and materiality after mass murder*. Unpublished essay. www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/faculty/bucholtz/research
Bucholtz, Mary. 2017. Why bodies matter. In Jillian R. Cavanaugh and Shalini Shankar (eds.), *Language and materiality: Ethnographic and theoretical explanations*. New York: Oxford University Press. 260–264.
Casillas, Dolores Inés. 2008. A morning dose of Latino masculinity: U.S. Spanish-language radio and the politics of gender. In Angharad Valdivia (ed.), *Latina/o communication studies today*. New York: Peter Lang. 161–184.
Casillas, Dolores Inés. 2011. Sounds of surveillance: U.S. Spanish-language radio patrols la migra. *American Quarterly* 63(3): 807–829.
Casillas, Dolores Inés. 2014. *Sounds of belonging: U.S. Spanish-language radio and public advocacy*. New York: New York University Press.
Delgado Bernal, Dolores, Rebeca Burciaga, and Judith Flores Carmona (eds.). 2012. Chicana/Latina *testimonios:* Methodologies, pedagogies, and political urgency. Special issue of *Equity and Excellence in Education*.
Flores, Nelson, and Jonathan Rosa. 2015. Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review* 85(2): 149–171.
Hoang, Haivan V. 2015. *Writing against racial injury: The politics of Asian American student rhetoric*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
Hutchins, Edwin. 1995. *Cognition in the wild*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Lee, Stacey J. 2009. *Unraveling the "model minority" stereotype: Listening to Asian American youth*. Second edn. New York: Teachers College Press.
Lopez, Mark Hugo. 2016. Is speaking Spanish necessary to be Hispanic? Most Hispanics say no. *Pew Research Center*. www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/02/19/is-speaking-spanish-necessary-to-be-hispanic-most-hispanics-say-no
Matias, Cheryl E. 2016. *Feeling white: Whiteness, emotionality, and education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
Meyer, Christian, Jürgen Streeck, and J. Scott Jordan (eds.). 2017. *Intercorporeality: Emerging socialities in interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Rosa, Jonathan. 2015. Racializing language, regimenting Latinas/os: Chronotope, social tense, and American raciolinguistic features. *Language and Communication* 46: 106–117.
Rosa, Jonathan, and Yarimar Bonilla. 2017. Deprovincializing Trump, decolonizing diversity, and unsettling anthropology. *American Ethnologist* 44(2): 201–208.
Rosa, Jonathan, and Nelson Flores. 2017. Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society* 46(5): 621–647.
Solórzano, Daniel G., and Tara J. Yosso. 2002. Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 8(1): 23–44.
Urciuoli, Bonnie. 2010. Entextualizing *diversity*: Semiotic incoherence in institutional discourses. *Language and Communication* 30: 48–57.

INDEX